

I am concerned about how this bill will affect private security personnel who use firearms within the course and scope of their employment. The DPSST armed private security certification alone provides no affirmative defenses or statutory exemptions regarding the possession of firearms in public places. As such, many persons certified through DPSST as armed private security professionals also obtain an Oregon Concealed Handgun License as the means of pre-empting local rules and regulations that would otherwise affect their use of their firearms at work, going to work, or coming from work.

Consider a licensed member of an executive protection team waiting to pick up their client from the baggage claim at PDX airport. Their ability to carry a firearm comes not from their DPSST certification, but from their concealed handgun license. If this bill passed as currently written, they would be guilty of a crime.

Consider a licensed armored truck courier with their work firearm locked in their backpack waiting for the MAX on their way to work. If this bill passed as currently written, TriMet could ban firearms at MAX stations and this employee could be charged with a crime.

Consider an armed private security employee dropping their son or daughter off at school before work. If this bill passed as currently written, that employee could be charged with a crime for that action.

For these reasons I oppose this bill as currently written. I understand the intent of the bill and in general I agree that protections afforded by the Oregon CHL are too broad--that license should not be the reason that persons can open carry AR-15s at the capitol. However, please consider adding exemptions for private security personnel while engaged in their duties.